

ITEMS

VOLUME 5 • NUMBER 2 • JUNE 1951
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

"SOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND PERSONALITY: CONTRIBUTIONS OF W. I. THOMAS TO THEORY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH"

by Edmund H. Volkart

WITHIN a few weeks the Social Science Research Council will publish a volume¹ having the title given this article. The volume contains seventeen selections from Thomas' published and unpublished writings during the years 1909-1937, together with a comprehensive bibliography of his published works. It makes available in convenient form, and for a contemporary audience, some of the most important and influential writing in American social science.

As the title suggests, the volume is not intended to be either a complete or a fully representative collection of Thomas' writings. Rather, the emphasis is on those works which are most significant from the standpoint of present-day social science, and which reveal most clearly the extent of its indebtedness to him. Accordingly the selections favor his later theoretical contributions at the expense of earlier papers on such topics as folk psychology, sex differences, race prejudice, and intergroup relations. The latter are still interesting but they do not fit the purpose of the volume, which is to present Thomas' most mature thought in a form that stresses relevance to contemporary intellectual issues.

This purpose may be clarified by a brief summary of the organization and contents of the volume. Part I, "Social Science and Social Behavior," contains several statements on the crucial methodological problems which, Thomas felt, the behavior sciences must face. Among its seven selections are an excerpt from "The Persistence of Primary-group Norms in Present-day

Society,"² the "Methodological Note" from *The Polish Peasant* (1918-20),³ "The Behavior Pattern and the Situation" (his Presidential address to the American Sociological Society, 1927),⁴ and the less well-known, but highly rewarding, essay "The Relation of Research to the Social Process" (1931).⁵ Thomas' approach to the problem of causality in social science, his emphasis on the "situational" approach to behavior, and his arguments and illustrations in behalf of life histories as a source of data are to be found in these selections.

In Part II, "Social Behavior and Personal Dynamics," there are four selections which are focused upon the individual and his personality. Here, in addition to three formulations of the "four wishes" concept, there is the Introduction to "Life-Record of an Immigrant," a significant feature of *The Polish Peasant*. In it a theory of social personality is developed at great length, an analysis that remains of considerable value to contemporary students of the interrelationships between culture and personality. "The Configurations of Personality" (1927)⁶ is the final selection in this Part and contains Thomas' analysis of the "creative process."

Part III comprises five selections under the general heading "Social Behavior and Cultural Dynamics." It represents Thomas' concern with two different, though

² In *Suggestions of Modern Science Concerning Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), pp. 159-197.

³ W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (2nd ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927). Vol. I, pp. 1-69.

⁴ *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, Vol. 22, pp. 1-13.

⁵ In *Essays on Research in the Social Sciences* (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1931), pp. 175-194.

⁶ In *The Unconscious: A Symposium* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), pp. 143-177.

¹ Edited, with an Introduction, by the present writer, and sponsored by the Council's Committee on W. I. Thomas' Contributions to Social Science: Donald Young (chairman), Herbert Blumer, Thorsten Sellin, and Dorothy S. Thomas.

related, problems: the cultural process as such, and the phenomena of social disorganization. The famous Introduction to *Source Book for Social Origins* (1909) is to be found here, along with excerpts from *The Polish Peasant* setting forth the nature of social disorganization, social reorganization, and social reconstruction. A chapter from *The Unadjusted Girl* (1923) entitled "The Individualization of Behavior," and one from *Old World Traits Transplanted* (1921)⁷ dealing with problems of assimilation round out the section. Through all these selections runs Thomas' insistence that the study of behavior must be undertaken within a relevant context, whether it be one of disorganization, primary-group organization, or culture contact and change.

Part IV, "Personality and Culture," contains Thomas' previously unpublished report to the Social Science Research Council on the organization of a program of research in this field. Written in 1933, it presents some challenging research suggestions as well as a tentative theoretical analysis. Nowhere is Thomas' well-focused, multidimensional approach to the study of behavior more clearly delineated. Its publication, at a time when culture-personality theory and research seem relatively disorganized, should prove decidedly useful.

Obviously a brief summary such as this can only indicate the range of Thomas' thought, not its originality, vitality, or significance for contemporary social science. These can be obtained from the volume itself, wherein Thomas' ideas can be viewed in their historical context, the context of his total thought, and the context of the general development of American social science. Only in this perspective can his genuine contributions be fully appreciated.

At the same time it would be erroneous to conclude that the volume is merely another testament to a great historical figure. It is that, of course, but it is much more. Unquestionably Thomas was one of a few men who gave to social science its current scope and direction; renewed familiarity with his thought, therefore, will considerably enhance our understanding of the contemporary scene. Indeed, it is hoped that publication of these selections from his writings will have beneficial results on several levels.

First, and most obviously, it should encourage reappraisal of Thomas' stature as a contributor to the behavior sciences. Heretofore, appraisals of him have tended to be handicapped by insufficient familiarity with all his works. They were too scattered in time and place to facilitate adequate appraisal, and Thomas never wrote a theoretical synthesis that could be re-

garded as a final statement of his views. The present collection may, therefore, lead to clearer recognition of the fact that Thomas was more than a casual contributor to the literature on criminology, race relations, or social maladjustment—that he was, in fact, concerned with fundamental problems of behavioral description and interpretation, and this in a systematic manner.

Second, the volume may contribute to a renewed sense of the continuity that underlies the growth of all true science. Since Thomas' active career in social science covered some fifty years, beginning in 1894, he may be regarded as a link between the older social science and the newer—on the one hand, maintaining the best of earlier thought, and on the other, adding to it from his own experience, creative imagination, and analytical skill. Further, he was in a position to assess the contributions of each of the social sciences to the study of behavior, as well as to lead the way toward their integration into a single science of behavior. Similarly, much of the contemporary emphasis on empirical field work, interdisciplinary research, and the closer ties between theory and data stems from Thomas' efforts along these lines.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the volume may again direct attention to the "situation" as a fundamental concept of social science. In Thomas' view the concept of "situation" simultaneously serves three separate, though related, functions. First, it represents the essence of human experience as we know it in our common-sense living; thus it has the quality of being genuine and realistic. Second, it serves as a methodological tool, in so far as it represents the *conditions* under which the description and interpretation of behavior must be undertaken. And, third, the "situation" is the kind of concept which permits a common focus of the several social sciences; for, if behavior is the outcome of the *definition of the situation* by the actor or actors, as Thomas maintained, we must know the various determinants of the definitions. This knowledge can be obtained only through the joint efforts of the sciences concerned both with the individual organism and its social environment.

The above remarks, of course, only suggest the scope and pertinence of Thomas' work; they do not exhaust it. In the available space it is impossible even to touch upon such intriguing conceptions as those of "crisis," "life organization," "rational social control," "subjective experience," and others that are indissolubly linked with his name. But then, this article does not pretend to be a complete analysis. It merely underlines the enduring quality of W. I. Thomas' contributions to social science, and suggests their timeliness.

⁷ As explained in the Council's forthcoming publication, p. 259, W. I. Thomas has been acknowledged as the primary author of this volume, in association with R. E. Park and H. A. Miller.

BASIC RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AS A STRATEGIC FACTOR IN THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES*

by Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr.

EVERY field of scientific inquiry is marked by periods in its development in which investigators appear to be riding off in all directions at once. This is a scouting and pioneering phase in which men seek to locate the most promising trails and bases for more systematic exploration and exploitation. In time there begins to emerge some agreement as to what the main objectives of inquiry should be. Research resources and efforts then become focused on these areas until knowledge and understanding of them is established firmly enough to permit further exploratory advances into the unknown regions beyond.

It is my opinion that in the social sciences we are now ready for a new formulation of the main objectives on which there is substantial agreement and on which research efforts should be focused. This task of formulating an agreement upon objectives having priority is a responsibility of social scientists themselves; it would be arrogant and futile were a central body, self-appointed or constituted by outside authority, to attempt any such function.

The social scientists at any given university who undertake to formulate and agree upon immediate research objectives will have many difficulties. There will be some who are so keenly aware of immediate and pressing problems in the world of so-called practical affairs that they will be impatient of their colleagues who hold that the more remote from practical interests a research problem is, the more significant its scientific contribution is likely to be. And even though there may be general agreement that research on basic problems must be protected from demands for immediately useful results, the funds available to those who undertake quickly to find practical answers to practical problems are a strong attraction. Furthermore, contact with live problems is necessary for a healthy and vigorous social

science. Work on these problems frequently uncovers important theoretical and methodological leads. Such research activities, however, will not continue to hold the interest of the best scientific talent, yield the most fertile ideas, or attract the kind of support necessary for a sustained attack on basic problems. On the other hand, the recondite and remote preoccupations which give little promise of increasing our understanding of the significant problems of our times also have little chance of attracting talent or support.

We can contrive an intermediate statement of the problem which will serve several purposes. I should like to see groups of social scientists take time to attempt to state what they regard as the most important research areas at the present time and to state these problems in such a way as to:

- (1) Secure not only agreement among their colleagues but excite interest and motivation leading to actual convergence of effort on these focal problems;
- (2) Promote this convergence of effort even among those who hold to divergent theories and methods; and
- (3) Permit ready translation of the scientific problems into what can be agreed upon as significant practical problems confronting our society.

This is not an amiable puzzle game for relaxation after working hours. It is quite legitimate for serious supporters of research to ask what the informed social scientists regard as their most pressing scientific problems; and to ask further what bearing the solutions of these problems have on important practical problems; and to expect a reasonably coherent answer. As a matter of fact we ask ourselves these questions and we make choices on the basis of our answers even though the process may not be very conscious or explicit. I am merely suggesting that we make these considerations more explicit and systematic in the hope that we can maximize the extent of agreement as to the relative importance of problem areas, and increase the chances of convergence of talent and effort on these areas.

A statement of the major problems of our society can be cast in an almost unlimited number of ways. The best statement in any instance is that which best serves to communicate the speaker's perspectives and intentions. What follows is an attempt to try out some preliminary formulations, not for the whole range of the social sciences, but for the so-called social behavior

* This paper is an abridgment of one presented at the Ford Hall Dedication Program: "The Social Sciences - Mid Century," April 19-21, 1951, a series of conferences comprising part of the University of Minnesota's centennial celebration. The Council was invited to participate in arranging these conferences and is grateful to the program committee for permission to publish this article.

The general subject is being investigated for the Council by the author as a part of his study of opportunities and activities made possible by the grant to the Council from the Ford Foundation, as reported in the March 1951 issue of *Items*. He led a discussion of the topic at the spring meeting of the board of directors of the Council, March 31 - April 1, 1951.

fields: anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. The major problems are stated in a way intended to:

(a) Communicate the conviction that these are real problems that vitally affect the welfare and development of American society;

(b) Indicate the relevance of scientific research for the solution of these problems;

(c) Suggest that the conscious orientation of research to these problems will increase the likelihood that research findings will become additive; and,

(d) Suggest that the important problems now confronting American society are basic problems for any society. Varying conditions under which a society operates will lead to varying degrees of emphasis on one or another of the problems as stated, but they will all be present in some degree.

BASIC RESEARCH PROBLEMS

1. *Values and value orientation.* Every society is faced with the problem of articulating those objectives and values which appear to give meaning and significance to its existence and actions, and to the activities of its individual members. This problem is more acute at some times than at others. It was never more urgent in our own history than now. Concretely stated, the problems our society faces in this field are to maximize the participation of its members in the clarification of the values they regard as basic; and further to maximize their capacity to appraise our institutional structures for implementing these values.

2. *Communication and consensus.* A society must maintain effective communication among its parts in order to develop and maintain that basic consensus concerning values, beliefs, and institutional behavior, upon which its existence must rest, as well as to enable its component individuals and groups to integrate their actions. This is as true of a family group as it is of nations and empires. Indeed, the effectiveness of the communication process is a measure of the social integration of a society. This fact is often mistakenly taken to mean that effective communication guarantees amicable relations.

Communication and consensus are reciprocal parts of the same process. Communication extends the range of experience which is held in common; and a minimum of consensus is necessary for communication to take place.

When one considers the divergence of experience represented in the geographic, occupational, educational, ethnic, age, sex, status, functional, and other less obvious but not less profound differentials in the American

population, he becomes at once aware of both the tremendous accomplishment represented in the degree of social integration we have achieved, and of the enormous magnitude of the problems involved in the maintenance and extension of our communication and consensus-building processes. This latter realization is made all the more acute when one considers how difficult it is to establish and maintain effective communication with one's fellow social scientists. Obviously the problem of communication goes much deeper than what we find out by counting radios and television sets and by charting reading, listening, and looking habits.

3. *Social participation and the individual sense of worth and competence.* The marked difference between totalitarian and democratic conceptions of the relation of the individual to the state tends to obscure the fact that even in totalitarian states it appears necessary to give the individual citizen at least the illusion of power, worth, and participation. The incessant parades and meetings, the activities of the age-group organizations; the constant indoctrination of the citizens designed to produce a strong identification with symbols like "The People," "The Folk," "The Master Race"; and many other similar devices appear to be effective at least as long as rigid control of channels of information prevents exposure of the people to contradictory evidence. Democratic theories, on the other hand, hold that a society is not safe unless the citizenry has access to full information and can freely discuss the pros and cons and take a genuine part in the decisions, direction, and control of that society.

The two conceptions set very different problems of implementation and of research. "Mass manipulation" can stand for the essential technology of collective integration in totalitarian societies. It calls for emphasis on the "push-button," stimulus-response, and simple conditioning conceptions of training and control. In contrast, we can say that "participant experimentation" suggests the approach and the body of technique more appropriate to democratic social integration. The latter obviously calls for more complex and difficult processes of communication and interaction. But whereas the mass manipulation approach to human social control places the population more or less in the position of conditioned rats and yields a false sense of personal worth and participation, the processes of participant experimentation yield a genuine sense of worthy and responsible sharing in the creation of the values and conditions of one's own society.

4. *Competition and conflict and their control.* Hardly anyone would question the fact that American society faces serious problems of internal tension and conflict

among many of its important segments, or that we have yet to discover the proper balance of control and freedom in economic competition. Some feel so threatened by the problems of control of social opposition that they are tempted by the apparent answers offered by the corporate state. However, struggle among opposed interests is regarded as not only normal but necessary in the American version of democracy. The problem is not one of eliminating conflict as such, but of providing channels and techniques through which differences may be adjusted without disrupting the social order, specific issues resolved, and constructive compromises discovered. The "sweetness and light" approach which characterizes much of what is called personnel work or human relations in industrial or racial or community settings, while temporarily soothing, must be replaced by more accurate analysis of situations in opposition, by communication across conflict barriers, and by the discovery of new bases of consensus and integration.

5. *Incorporation of the culture in the individual.* The continuity of a social system depends primarily upon: (a) the development in the young of those basic conceptions of self and expectations of others which enable the individual to perceive and react in his various life situations in a manner which supports the basic value and institutional structure of that system; (b) the transmission of the specific value orientations and interaction patterns which enable him to integrate his behavior with others in the various roles he may occupy in his life situations; and (c) the development of the specific skills called for in these roles.

All points of significant contact between the child and his society provide experiences which contribute to this development and transmission, the most potent and explicit of which are in the family, school, and peer groups. Thus far we appear to have kept reasonably abreast of the problems of this social function with respect to vocational skills and techniques. There is less cause for satisfaction with the clarity of objectives and effectiveness of method with respect to the basic socialization and value-orientation processes.

6. *Institutional organization and management.* Institutional structures are the machinery by which a society performs its functions and implements its values. The complexity of the institutional structure of our society gives rise to many problems of efficiency of institutional machinery, as well as a whole body of technology of management and administration. Everyone who has been concerned with policy and administration in any relatively complex organization knows that there are times of crisis when he and his colleagues become more aware than usual of the dense and frequently self-

defeating proliferation of institutional machinery which accompanies the normal processes of growth.

At such times a "reorganization" is often undertaken, and this calls for many painful adjustments throughout the organization. Sometimes such reorganization is based upon clearheaded analysis of the processes and functions to be implemented by appropriately designed structures. More often than one likes to admit, however, the so-called reorganization is carried through without any clear realization of what is involved. In such cases it usually results in an organizational chart which bears little relation to the realities of functions and relationships. Such unproductive outcomes are usually the result of inadequate analysis of value-objectives, functional roles, situational contexts, and of little or no understanding of the basic social processes upon which effective social integration depends. Tinkering with institutional machinery of a society with no understanding of the basic processes nor of the "engineering" problems involved is a costly pastime. The problem we face is the accumulation of the necessary scientific knowledge and the technical skill in the analysis of functions and of structures and operations best adapted to these functions.

ADVANTAGES OF AGREEMENT

ON OBJECTIVES

The foregoing statement is one way of defining certain of the major problems confronting any society and our own in particular. This listing is designed to open rather than to close discussion. If through discussion of a number of attempts, agreement on some basic list can be arrived at, then the possible focuses of research effort can be derived from such a list. When agreement is reached on the focal objectives of research, we may anticipate certain advantages:

1. Research planning can become more coherent and gain more point and direction.
2. Research which is proposed may be evaluated as to relevance and significance in this context.
3. With common focuses, research results are more likely to become additive, than with our present lack of explicit agreement on priority objectives.
4. The relevance of basic research for the solution of urgent practical problems may be more readily understood by laymen than is now the case.

It may be argued that to give the planning and conduct of research more coherence, point and direction, and to increase its additive potentialities, it should be focused on the testing of systematic theory rather than on objectives derived from the basic practical problems which face our society. The argument is entirely valid

on logical grounds, but raises difficulties of a practical nature. The state of theory in the field of human social behavior is such that it would be more difficult to get a working consensus on a theoretical than on a problem basis. Moreover, at the present stage of theoretical development it would probably hinder rather than help the growth of the science. We are still in that state of relative ignorance which is best helped by forays in different theoretical directions. Nor does the use of a problem frame of reference to focus research prevent a simultaneous use of systematic theory for selection of problems within that frame of reference. By focusing the research of scientists with competing theories on common problem areas, we may more readily join theoretical issues and make critical tests of the relative adequacy of the different theories.

No attempt will be made here to specify the research, that is now under way or that might be undertaken, relevant to the understanding and solution of the types of problems outlined. Those who are active in the general field of research on human behavior will have already begun to fill in the outline.

It should be emphasized again that this effort to define basic research objectives has not involved any notion of laying out *the* research problems; but some major ones have been suggested. If these proposals stimulate attention and effort among social scientists and if they debate their divergent ideas, there is every reason to anticipate some fruitful convergences as well as divergences, both of which will produce valuable focusing of research plans. The increase of additive results is what we must strive for by whatever means.

FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS TO LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

THROUGH the initiative and generosity of the Twentieth Century Fund, the Council has recently been able to make grants of \$5,000 each to 18 liberal arts colleges to support certain social science faculty members on part-time research during the academic year 1951-52. The program of Faculty Research Grants, modeled somewhat on the pattern of the Council's Faculty Research Fellowship program, was designed to encourage research in the social sciences while at the same time enabling the colleges to retain on their faculties some younger social science teachers whose appointments might otherwise have had to be terminated as a consequence of reduced enrollments in this time of military mobilization. A sum sufficient to provide for half as many grants for 1952-53 has also been provided by the Twentieth Century Fund.

Although a major purpose is to prevent the loss of recently appointed members of social science faculties who would be the first to be dropped as a consequence of reduced college budgets, it appeared undesirable to offer direct grants to individuals whose appointments for the coming year are in jeopardy—a procedure which might carry a stigma of "relief." Hence, in accord with the Council's primary concern for the encouragement and support of research, awards were based on the merits of research projects to be carried out by mature faculty members of established competence. Each college receiving a grant has agreed to release one or more faculty members for research during a substantial part of the time in the coming academic year, and to apply the full amount of the grant to the salary budget of its social science departments. Thus in each case the grant assures

the continued employment of one or more teachers whose appointments might otherwise not have been renewed, while at the same time enabling one or more competent scholars to carry on research in social science. The identities of the former are not to be published; the names of the scholars whose research is to be supported are given in the list of awards below.

Only accredited, independent, non-tax-supported liberal arts colleges were eligible to compete for grants. Letters of invitation were sent to the heads of the approximately 400 such institutions in the United States which admit male students and might therefore be directly affected by entrance of actual and potential students into the armed forces. Applications were received from 132 institutions, about a third of those eligible. Recipients of awards were selected by a specially appointed Committee on Faculty Research Grants, composed of deans of universities ineligible for grants. Members of the committee are Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Cornell University (chairman); W. J. Brogden, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, University of Wisconsin; Elmer Ellis, Dean of the College of Arts and Science, University of Missouri; Eldon L. Johnson, Dean of Liberal Arts and of the Graduate School, University of Oregon; Ralph W. Tyler, Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago.

When the Twentieth Century Fund's appropriation was offered to the Council in the second week of March, it was evident that speedy action would be essential if the purpose of preventing the loss of promising young

faculty members was to be accomplished. Announcement of the program was made in the press on Sunday, March 18, and letters of invitation were mailed so as to reach the college heads on the following day. April 3 was set as the closing date for applications, and the committee met on April 11 to make awards. Thus in less than a month all institutions were notified of the outcome of their applications. Under such an exacting time schedule, it was impossible to conduct the extensive investigation which normally precedes action on applications for fellowships and grants of the Council. As the committee was obliged to base its judgments on proposals for research which were submitted on short notice, an advantage was undoubtedly enjoyed by institutions whose faculty members already had in hand suitable research projects. An interesting and probably desirable consequence is the fact that awards were made to several institutions which are far less widely known than many whose applications were unsuccessful.

It is hardly possible to conduct a competition of this nature without being led to reflect upon the general question of the place of research in the small liberal arts college. There was ample evidence of research under way in such institutions, but much of it is being done in fulfillment of requirements for doctoral degrees. (The committee declined to make grants to support work on doctoral theses, thinking it better to encourage continued research by mature scholars.) A considerable number of institutions proposed to undertake studies of an introspective nature, concerning their own history, their curricula, or their alumni. Projects of this type were not generally viewed by the committee as meeting the desired criteria for social science research. A few of the applications unhappily confirmed the impression that in some colleges interest is expressed in research only when it appears to carry extraneous rewards.

Even if the decline of college enrollments in the coming year turns out to be less extreme and the reduction of teaching staffs less drastic than was widely anticipated last winter, the Faculty Research Grants should still serve the very important purpose of recognizing and supporting social science research in a category of academic institutions where it has generally received too little recognition and even less tangible support. Quite apart from helping to keep intact the social science departments of financially hard-pressed colleges, demonstration of the compatibility of original scholarly investigation and good college teaching can be counted as a gain both for social science and for general education.

The following Faculty Research Grants were made:

Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas, for research by J. Winfield Fretz and Cornelius Krahn on the history

of Mennonite refugees from the U.S.S.R. to the Americas.

Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama, for historical research by Joseph H. Parks, and research on the sociology of race relations by Howard H. Harlan.

Claremont Men's College, Claremont, California, for research by Orme W. Phelps on labor-public relations, and by A. J. Vandermeulen on the costs of governmental services.

Colgate University, Hamilton, New York, for one or more of several alternative projects.

Elon College, North Carolina, for research by Elisha P. Douglass on origins of the American conservative tradition, and by Robert F. Hunter on the history of turnpikes.

Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee, for research by Jitsuiichi Masuoka and Donald Wyatt on race and minority group problems.

Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, for research by Kenyon A. Knopf on the economics of the rubber industry, and by Muni Frumhartz on the sociology of protest movements.

The College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho, for research by Leslie V. Brock on finance in the American colonial period.

Indiana Central College, Indianapolis, Indiana, for research by Kenneth E. St. Clair on the administration of justice during the Reconstruction Period in North Carolina.

Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, for research by Hoyt L. Warner on a political biography of John Hessin Clarke, and by Raymond English on the fundamentals of democracy in the United States and England.

Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois, for one or more of several alternative projects.

Reed College, Portland, Oregon, for research by Richard H. Jones on English constitutional history, and by David H. French on American Indian cultures.

Roosevelt College, Chicago, Illinois, for research by Walter A. Weisskopf on socio-psychology of economic thought, and by S. Kirson Weinberg and St. Clair Drake on race relations among students.

St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa, for research by Matthew M. McMahon and Henry J. Schmandt on pressure groups acting upon the city government of Davenport.

St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota, for research by Kenneth Bjork on Scandinavian migration to the Pacific coast.

Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa, for research by Carl F. Reuss and August Baetke on personal and social adjustment of the aged.

Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, for research by David D. Marsh on the Radical Republican Movement in Missouri—a test of the Beard thesis.

Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts, for research by Kermit Gordon on market organization and price policy, and by James M. Burns on democratic leadership.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Shepard B. Clough, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Morris E. Opler, Joseph J. Spengler.

Definite plans were made at a meeting of the committee on April 28 for a conference to be held in June 1952 on research relating to economic growth in Brazil, India, and Japan. The major topics with which the conference will be concerned are agricultural and industrial development (including capital formation), population and labor force, business organization and structure, and social structure and the state. Five or more special papers are to be prepared for each of the three countries, before the end of the current calendar year, and the papers are to be supplemented in advance of the conference by written comments or critiques by designated discussants. On the basis of this documentation the conference will consider the extent to which common factors, stimuli, or obstacles affecting economic growth can be identified in the hope of laying the foundation for more effective analytical approaches to the general problems of growth and industrialization.

Arrangements for the preparation of papers will be made shortly on behalf of the committee by the chairmen of three subcommittees. The membership of the subcommittees is as follows: on Brazil—Charles Wagley of Columbia University (chairman), Preston James of Syracuse University, and Robert S. Smith of Duke University; on India—Morris E. Opler of Cornell University (chairman), Kingsley Davis of Columbia University, and Daniel Thorner of the University of Pennsylvania; on Japan—William W. Lockwood of Princeton University (chairman), Edwin O. Reischauer of Harvard University, Irene B. Taeuber of the Office of Population Research, and Robert E. Ward of the University of Michigan.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON

OLD AGE RESEARCH

Harold E. Jones (chairman), Ray E. Baber, Roy M. Dorcus, Lloyd Fisher, M. Bruce Fisher, James A. Hamilton, Oscar J. Kaplan, Clark Kerr, Elon H. Moore.

At a meeting held in Berkeley on April 20, the committee discussed current research projects of its members. Lloyd Fisher reported on the initial phases of a five-year study in the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California (Berkeley); this includes at present a demographic panel and a study of employment, income, and levels of living in relation to age. Plans were presented for a study of public opinion polls to be analyzed with reference to age, not merely in terms of content but also, if feasible, with regard to the flexibility and rigidity of opinion in successive age groups.

There was discussion also of a proposed study of the California Old Age Pension Law, presented by Ray Baber, and of a comparative study by Elon Moore of the social experi-

ence and adjustment of several groups of retired workers, in relation to their residence after retirement. H. E. J.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF ATOMIC ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Ansley J. Coale (chairman), Harold J. Barnett, J. Frederic Dewhurst, Tjalling C. Koopmans, Wassily W. Leontief, W. Rupert Maclaurin.

The conference on quantitative description of technological change, jointly planned and sponsored by this committee and the Committee on Economic Growth, was held at Princeton on April 6-8. It brought together approximately sixty persons for intensive discussion of research relating to the measurement or orderly description of the initiation and application of changes in technology. Preparation for the conference had been begun by the two committees more than a year in advance with the result that thirteen formal papers were available for consideration. Three others had been planned but for various reasons could not be completed in time for prior circulation. The topics considered included present limitations upon the feasibility of measuring technical changes, the sequences from the development of technical knowledge to the specific application of technical innovations, patent statistics and labor productivity indexes as sources of relevant data, and a number of specific problems relating to the quantitative analysis of technological changes.

The authors of conference papers were: Yale Brozen of Northwestern University, William M. Capron of the University of Illinois, Ansley J. Coale of Princeton University, Gerard Debreu of the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics, W. Duane Evans of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Joseph L. Fisher of the Council of Economic Advisers, S. Colum Gilfillan of the University of Chicago, Anne P. Grosse of Harvard University, Simon Kuznets of the University of Pennsylvania, Wassily W. Leontief of Harvard University, W. Rupert Maclaurin of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Jacob Schmookler of Michigan State College, and Alfred B. Stafford of the University of Wyoming.

The closing session of the conference sought to evaluate the feasibility and significance of further research on technological change. There appeared to be agreement that thus far research efforts on many of the most significant aspects of technological change have failed to produce conclusive results. There was also agreement that the importance of this area of research is so great that persistent efforts must be made to develop and test new research approaches. The members of the conference agreed to cooperate in the preparation, under the editorship of Ansley Coale, of a report of the discussion. This report is expected to include a critical evaluation of the conclusions reached, to be prepared by Simon Kuznets, and condensed or revised drafts of the conference papers.

PERSONNEL

FACULTY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

At its meeting on April 2, 1951, the Committee on Faculty Research Fellowships—Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul H. Buck, Paul W. Gates, Harold E. Jones, Donald G. Marquis, Dorothy S. Thomas, Schuyler C. Wallace, and Malcolm M. Willey—appointed seven Fellows to three-year terms beginning this fall. With the cooperation of their respective institutions the appointees will be enabled to devote at least half of their time to their own research while carrying on reduced teaching schedules. A list of the new Fellows and their fields of interest follows:

Allen L. Edwards, Professor of Psychology, University of Washington, will continue research on the measurement of attitudes and personality structure. He is the author of *Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education* (1946), *Psychology: Introduction to Human Behavior* (1949), *Experimental Design in Psychological Research* (1950), and of research papers in psychological journals.

Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., John Witherspoon Preceptor in Politics, with rank of Assistant Professor, Princeton University, will undertake a systematic study of the determinants of foreign policy. He is the author of several articles on inter-American relations and co-author of a forthcoming book on *American Foreign Policy in Transition*.

Arnold C. Harberger, Assistant Professor of Political Economy, Johns Hopkins University, will investigate the response of the pattern of world trade to changes in the relative prices of its components. He is the author of several studies of international trade and monetary problems.

Herbert McClosky, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota, will continue his work on the application of quantitative psychological and sociological methods to the study of participation, awareness, and responsibility in political behavior. He has contributed articles to various psychological and political science journals.

Milton Rokeach, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Michigan State College, will investigate the nature and determinants of narrow-mindedness and dogmatism, and develop appropriate methods of measurement. He has published numerous articles on related topics in psychological journals.

Herbert A. Shepard, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, will continue experimental and observational studies of the process of communication within small groups. He is the author of a forthcoming monograph on his previous work of a similar nature.

Anthony F. C. Wallace, Instructor in Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, will pursue studies of culture and personality with special reference to the role of the individual in culture change among the Iroquois. He is the author of *King of the Delawares* (1949), a monograph on personality structure of Tuscarora Indians as revealed by the Rorschach test (in press), and numerous articles in anthropological journals.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

Since making the appointments listed in the December issue of *Items*, the Committee on Social Science Personnel—Edward P. Hutchinson (chairman), Donald T. Campbell, William W. Howells, Earl Latham, Frank A. Southard, Jr., and Paul Webbink—has awarded 19 new research training fellowships:

Kenneth J. Arrow, Associate Professor of Economics and Statistics, Stanford University, postdoctoral fellowship for a study in Western Europe of statistical problems in economic planning.

George A. Austin, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, postdoctoral fellowship for research on the application of higher mathematics to concepts of visual perception.

Wendell Bell, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, for a comparative study in the methodology of urban analysis.

Lee Benson, Ph.D. candidate in history, Cornell University, postdoctoral fellowship for further training in economic theory and analysis.

Stephen T. Boggs, Ph.D. candidate in sociology and anthropology, Washington University, for a field study of Ojibwa acculturation and personality formation in two differentially acculturated local groups.

Barend A. DeVries, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and economist, International Monetary Fund, for an investigation into the price effects of currency devaluation.

Phyllis E. Geiss, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Cornell University, and Junior Research Officer, London School of Economics, for a study of participation and leadership in local political parties in an English constituency.

Christoph M. Heinicke, Ph.D. candidate in social psychology, Harvard University, for training in the theory and techniques of research in child development.

Lawrence J. R. Herson, Ph.D. candidate in government, Yale University, for research on the Illinois administrative reorganization of 1917.

Herbert C. Kelman, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Yale University, postdoctoral fellowship for research on the internalization of group goals with special reference to therapeutic groups.

Melvin L. Kohn, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Cornell University, for an analysis of unpatterned situations in intergroup relations.

Edward E. LeClair, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in economics, Clark University, and Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology, Norwich University, for training in anthropology and the development of theories of economic value for nonliterate communities.

Abraham S. Levine, Ph.D. in psychology, University of Minnesota, and Chief, Personality Dimensions Branch, Human Resources Research Center, U. S. Air Force, for research on the relationship of perseveration to theories of learning, personality, and abilities.

- Merton H. Miller, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Johns Hopkins University, for case studies of discrimination in railway rates.
- James Olds, Ph.D. candidate in social psychology, Harvard University, for the development and testing of a conceptual scheme relevant to problems of motivation, symbolic processes, and learning.
- Allan P. Sindler, Ph.D. candidate in government, Harvard University, for a study of the political process in Louisiana.
- Maurice R. Stein, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Columbia University, for research on the sociology of work motivation.
- Robert Summers, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Stanford University, for research on uncertainty and the size of the firm.
- Samuel L. Tyler, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Utah, postdoctoral fellowship for a study of the Ute Indians in the Spanish and American southwest.

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAVEL GRANTS

At its meeting on April 13, 1951, the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships—Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Merle Fainsod, Robert B. Hall, Melville J. Herskovits, Roy F. Nichols, Lauriston Sharp, and Charles Wagley—awarded 24 new fellowships:

- Allen H. Barton, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Columbia University, postdoctoral fellowship for training and research in the United States on problems of Soviet social structure.
- David T. Cattell, Ph.D. candidate in international relations, Columbia University, for research in the United States and Europe on Soviet Russian participation in the Spanish Civil War, 1936-39.
- Richard J. Coughlin, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Yale University, for a study in Thailand of the assimilation of the Chinese minority.
- Ralph T. Fisher, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for a study in the United States of a changing Soviet ideal, 1918-49: the young Communist as depicted at the Congresses of the Komsomol.
- Roger F. Hackett, Ph.D. candidate in history, Harvard University, for research in Japan on the role of militarism in modern Japan, as seen through the career of General Yamagata Aritomo.
- William D. Hohenthal, Jr., Ph.D. and Research Assistant in Anthropology, University of California, for research in Brazil on Indian communities of the lower São Francisco Valley.
- James C. Ingram, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Cornell University, for study in Thailand of aspects of economic change.
- David Joravsky, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for study in the United States and Europe of Soviet Communist philosophy, 1917-32.
- James A. Kokoris, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Michigan, for research in Japan on the role of finance in the economic life and growth of the community of Okayama.

- Paul F. Langer, Ph.D. candidate in Far Eastern Studies, Columbia University, for a historical and analytical study in Japan of the Japanese student movement.
- George S. N. Luckyj, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic literature, Columbia University, for research in the United States on the suppression of Soviet Ukrainian literary organizations.
- Daniel F. McCall, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for research in West Africa on the emergence of the urban African.
- Phoebe Vestal Ottenberg (Mrs. Simon Ottenberg), Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Northwestern University, for research in Nigeria on the social and economic role of women in Ibo culture.
- Simon Ottenberg, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Northwestern University, for research in Nigeria on the impact of colonialism among the Ibo.
- Raymond T. Powell, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of California, and Instructor in Economics, Princeton University, for research in the United States on Soviet monetary policy.
- Isaac M. Sacks, Ph.D. candidate in government, Yale University, for study in Indochina of the development of Vietnamese nationalism under French rule.
- Gaston J. Sigur, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Michigan, for research in Japan on the Okayama Han during the last century and a half of the Tokugawa period, 1700-1868.
- Robert J. Smith, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Cornell University, for investigation in Japan of the impact of the West on a rural Japanese community, with emphasis on technological change.
- William W. Stein, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Cornell University, for research in Peru on the influence of industrialism in an Andean commune.
- Joseph L. Sutton, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Michigan, for research in Japan on a political biography of Inukai Tsuyoshi, a study of political democratic leadership.
- Robert Van Niel, Ph.D. candidate in history, Cornell University, for study in Indonesia of the rise of nationalism and the effects of Western contacts.
- Frederick L. Wernstedt, Fulbright Scholar and Ph.D. candidate in geography, University of California at Los Angeles, for study in the Philippine Islands of the present-day human occupation of Negros Island.
- David A. Wheatley, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Michigan, for an ecological study in Japan of local community expansion.
- Allen S. Whiting, Ph.D. candidate in public law and government, Columbia University, for research in the United States on Soviet policy in China, 1917-24, and study of the Chinese language.

Travel grants were awarded to the following 5 scholars:

- Gordon T. Bowles, Ph.D. in anthropology, Executive Secretary of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, for research in Japan on the changing significance of biological to cultural factors in Japanese society.
- Einar I. Haugen, Thompson Professor of Scandinavian Languages, University of Wisconsin, for a study of inter-Scandinavian communication.
- Allen R. Holmberg, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Cornell University, for an experiment

in health, nutrition, and agriculture on the hacienda of Vicos, Callejon de Huaylas, Peru.

Raymond E. Lindgren, Associate Professor of History, Vanderbilt University, for a contemporary history of Scandinavia and research on the dissolution of the Union of Norway and Sweden, 1905-1907.

Charles F. Remer, Professor of Economics, University of Michigan, for a study of the economic development of Japan.

GRANTS-IN-AID

Following its annual meeting on March 28, 1951, the Committee on Grants-in-Aid—George W. Stocking (chairman), Ray A. Billington, Richard S. Crutchfield, Henry W. Ehrmann, and John W. Riley, Jr.—announced awards to 28 scholars in support of their individual research:

David F. Aberle, Visiting Associate Professor of Anthropology, Page School, Johns Hopkins University, for an analysis of the peyote cult as a social movement among the Navajo Indians.

Richard Bardolph, Assistant Professor of History, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, for a study of the organization and administration of North Carolina troops in the Civil War.

Charles S. Blackton, Assistant Professor of History, Colgate University, for a study in Ontario of the political action of British emigrants in Upper Canada and its effects on relations with Britain and on the shaping of Canadian nationality and society.

Norman S. Buchanan, Professor of Economics, University of California, for study of the economic problems of underdeveloped areas.

Howard F. Cline, Assistant Professor of History, Northwestern University, for an ethno-historical study of San Pedro Yolox and related villages in Upper Chinantla, Sierra de Juarez, Oaxaca, Mexico.

Luther S. Cressman, Head, Department of Anthropology and Director of the Museum of Natural History, University of Oregon, for a study of Klamath (Oregon) Indian cultural pre-history and its place in the culture of the Northern Great Basin.

Raymond E. Crist, Professor of Geography, University of Maryland, for a study in Western Cuba of changing patterns of land tenure and land use.

Alexander DeConde, Assistant Professor of History, Whittier College, for a study of the importance of public opinion in bringing about peace between the United States and France in 1800.

Sebastian de Grazia, Assistant Professor of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago, and Fulbright Research Scholar, for an investigation in Italy into the stability of popular political loyalty under conditions of rapid change of political rulers and governmental forms.

Raymond de Roover, Associate Professor of Economics, Wells College, for research on the organization of medieval trade.

Dewey W. Grantham, Jr., Assistant Professor of History, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, for a history of the Progressive movement in the South, 1890-1917.

Mozell C. Hill, Professor of Sociology, Atlanta University, to test the validity, reliability, and applicability of two tools for research on the status structure of a community.

Mark D. Hirsch, Teacher, High School of Music and Art, New York, and Lecturer, College of the City of New York, for a political history of New York City since the Civil War.

Charles S. Hyneman, Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University, for a study of legislative personnel and legislative tenure in 13 selected states.

Samuel J. Konefsky, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Brooklyn College, for the preparation of a book, "Holmes and Brandeis: A Study in the Influence of Ideas."

Frank R. Kramer, Chairman, Department of Classical Languages and Literature, Heidelberg College, for a study of the intermingling of Old World folkways under the impact of agricultural and industrial developments.

Melvin Kranzberg, Assistant Professor of History, Amherst College, for research in France on the social and political history of the "Liberal Empire."

George E. Lewis, Associate Professor of History, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, for research on Samuel Wharton, eighteenth century Indian trader and land speculator.

Samuel C. McCulloch, Associate Professor of History and Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Rutgers University, for research in Australia on the history of Eastern Australia, 1835-50.

Koppel S. Pinson, Associate Professor of History, Queens College, for research on Modern Germany, 1800-1950: the rise and fall of an empire.

Norman J. G. Pounds, Associate Professor of Geography, Indiana University, for research in Germany on the geography of the Ruhr industrial area.

Howard H. Quint, Adjunct Professor of History, University of South Carolina, for a study of the Socialist movement in the United States, 1886-1901.

Clinton L. Rossiter, Associate Professor of Government, Cornell University, for a study of the colonial origins of American democratic ideas.

Josiah C. Russell, Head, Department of History, University of New Mexico, for research primarily in Spain upon the history of population in the Middle Ages.

Arthur Schweitzer, Associate Professor of Economics, Indiana University, for study in Germany of the direct control of inflation—lessons of the German war economy.

Paul F. Sharp, Associate Professor of History, Iowa State College, for a study of the Whoop-Up Trail, a chapter in Canadian-American relations on the Great Plains.

Alexander Spoehr, Curator of Oceanic Ethnology, Chicago Natural History Museum, for a study of culture change and the reformation of community life on a war-devastated Pacific island.

George W. Zinke, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Colorado, for a study of the life and theories of David Ricardo.

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES

A new Committee on Identification of Talent, consisting of David McClelland of Wesleyan University (chairman), Alfred L. Baldwin of the University of Kansas, Urie Bronfenbrenner of Cornell University, and Fred L. Strodbeck of Yale University, has been appointed to plan research on

psychological and social variables related to the making of outstanding contributions by individuals to society.

Conrad M. Arensberg of Barnard College has been appointed a member of the Committee on Political Behavior.

Warren S. Torgerson of Princeton University will serve as staff for the new Committee on Scaling Theory and Methods, beginning July 15, 1951.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

The next closing dates for receipt of applications for Council fellowships and grants will be as follows:

Research Training Fellowships: August 15, 1951, for awards to be made in October by the Committee on Social Science Personnel; January 15, 1952, for awards to be made next April.

Area Research Training Fellowships and Travel Grants for Area Research: August 15, 1951, for awards to be made in October by the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships; January 15, 1952, for awards to be made next April.

Grants-in-Aid of Research: January 15, 1952, for awards to be made about April 1, 1952, by the Committee on Grants-in-Aid.

Faculty Research Fellowships: Preliminary nominations for appointments to become effective during the academic year 1952-53 must be filed not later than January 15, 1952 and preferably well in advance of that date.

Inquiries concerning each program should be addressed to the Washington office of the Council, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Applications for United States Government grants for the academic year 1952-53 for university lecturing and post-doctoral research abroad, under the Fulbright Act, will be accepted until October 15, 1951 for the United Kingdom (including the British Colonial Dependencies), France, Italy, Belgium-Luxembourg, Norway, Netherlands, Austria, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, and Iran.

Altogether in the above countries approximately 200 awards will be open to American scholars in all subjects. Applications have tended to concentrate around the pro-

grams for the United Kingdom, France, and Italy. Since the number of awards available for these three countries is limited, scholars interested in lecturing or research abroad should also familiarize themselves with the opportunities in the other countries participating in the program.

Requests for application forms and for detailed information regarding specific opportunities for lecturing and research during the academic year 1952-53 in the countries listed above should be addressed to the Executive Secretary, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D. C.

PUBLICATIONS

SSRC BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. About 360 pp. Cloth, \$3.00.

Support for Independent Scholarship and Research by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pp. \$1.25.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pp. \$1.50.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00.

Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

The Council's bulletins, monographs, and pamphlets are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

PAMPHLETS

Effective Use of Social Science Research in the Federal Services. Prepared with the assistance of the Council. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950. 47 pp. 50 cents.

A Directory of Social Science Research Organizations in Universities and Colleges by the Committee on Organization for Research. June 1950. 40 pp. Obtainable from the New York office of the Council.

Memorandum on University Research Programs in the Field of Labor 1950 by the Committee on Labor Market Research. 70 pp. Photo-offset. Obtainable from the New York office of the Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1951: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FRED EGGAN, ELMER ELLIS, CHARLES FAIRMAN, ROBERT B. HALL, PHILIP M. HAUSER, PENDLETON HERRING, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNIS, OTTO KLINEBERG, LYLE H. LANIER, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, ARTHUR W. MACMAHON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, LOWRY NELSON, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, DON K. PRICE, THEODORE W. SCHULTZ, ROBERT R. SEARS, GEORGE W. STOCKING, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, HOLBROOK WORKING, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR.; WENDELL C. BENNETT; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Financial Secretary*

2
S
1
S
-
-
S
,
-
-

7
7
1
-
7
1
.
1
.